# R L Brown Gifted And Talented Academy

**2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan**

## Table of Contents

# R L Brown Gifted And Talented Academy

### 1535 MILNOR ST, Jacksonville, FL 32206

### http://www.duvalschools.org/rlbrown

## Demographics

## Principal: Kristi Kincaid

Start Date for this Principal: 7/23/2019

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>KG-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2018-19 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2018-19 Economically<br>Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>Black/African American Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged<br>Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: C (45%)<br><br>2017-18: C (42%)<br><br>2016-17: C (45%)<br><br>2015-16: No Grade<br><br>2014-15: No Grade |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Northeast |
| **Regional Executive Director** | Cassandra Brusca |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | |
| **Support Tier** | |
| **ESSA Status** | TS&I |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here. | |

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

# Table of Contents

# R L Brown Gifted And Talented Academy

## 1535 MILNOR ST, Jacksonville, FL 32206

### http://www.duvalschools.org/rlbrown

## School Demographics

| **School Type and Grades Served** (per MSID File) | **2018-19 Title I School** | **2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary School KG-5 | Yes | 100% |

| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 86% |

## School Grades History

| Year | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | C | C | C |

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

The faculty and staff of Richard Lewis Brown Gifted and Academically Talented Academy will empower students to be successful in a global world.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

At Richard Lewis Brown Gifted and Academically Talented Academy, we are a community of diverse learners committed to engaging the whole child in rigorous instruction that challenges them to think critically, take risks and reflect on their learning.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|-------|-------------------------------|
| Kincaid, Kristi | Principal | Serves as an instructional leader, engages all school stakeholders in student learning, and collaborates in the school's decision making process. |
| Parris, Kendall | Assistant Principal | Serves as an instructional leader, engages all school stakeholders in student learning, and collaborates in the school's decision making process. |
| Nelson, Josh | School Counselor | Serves as an instructional support leader, engages all school stakeholders in student learning, and collaborates in the school's decision making process. |

### Early Warning Systems

**Current Year**

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-----------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 42 | 47 | 50 | 57 | 68 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 324 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 15 | 13 | 8 | 13 | 16 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 28 | 27 | 32 | 39 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 165 |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 14 | 23 | 20 | 25 | 32 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 146 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 4 | 2 | 0 | 16 | 8 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**
22

**Date this data was collected or last updated**
Friday 8/23/2019

## Prior Year - As Reported

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|---|---|---|
| Attendance below 90 percent | | |
| One or more suspensions | | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | | |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|---|---|---|
| Students with two or more indicators | | |

## Prior Year - Updated

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 11 | 15 | 12 | 11 | 14 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 |
| One or more suspensions | 4 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 5 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 8 | 17 | 25 | 45 | 26 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 146 |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 12 | 15 | 23 | 37 | 24 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 135 |

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

**School Data**
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 48% | 50% | 57% | 51% | 49% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 51% | 56% | 58% | 55% | 56% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 42% | 50% | 53% | 38% | 54% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 50% | 62% | 63% | 51% | 62% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 49% | 63% | 62% | 41% | 63% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 42% | 52% | 51% | 36% | 54% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 33% | 48% | 53% | 40% | 50% | 51% |

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 42 (0) | 47 (0) | 50 (0) | 57 (0) | 68 (0) | 60 (0) | 324 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 15 () | 13 () | 8 () | 13 () | 16 () | 9 () | 74 (0) |
| One or more suspensions | 2 () | 2 (0) | 0 (0) | 2 (0) | 1 (0) | 9 (0) | 16 (0) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 4 () | 1 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 5 (0) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 () | 28 (0) | 27 (0) | 32 (0) | 39 (0) | 39 (0) | 165 (0) |

**Grade Level Data**
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| ELA | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 52% | 51% | 1% | 58% | -6% |
| | 2018 | 39% | 50% | -11% | 57% | -18% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 13% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 49% | 52% | -3% | 58% | -9% |
| | 2018 | 43% | 49% | -6% | 56% | -13% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 10% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 43% | 50% | -7% | 56% | -13% |
| | 2018 | 48% | 51% | -3% | 55% | -7% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -5% | | | | |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 54% | 61% | -7% | 62% | -8% |
| | 2018 | 41% | 59% | -18% | 62% | -21% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 13% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 49% | 64% | -15% | 64% | -15% |
| | 2018 | 44% | 60% | -16% | 62% | -18% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 8% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 45% | 57% | -12% | 60% | -15% |
| | 2018 | 46% | 61% | -15% | 61% | -15% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 1% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 33% | 49% | -16% | 53% | -20% |
| | 2018 | 40% | 56% | -16% | 55% | -15% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

## Subgroup Data

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 22 | 44 | 36 | 23 | 40 | 38 | | | | | |
| BLK | 41 | 47 | 42 | 44 | 46 | 41 | 29 | | | | |
| WHT | 82 | 71 | | 73 | 71 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 38 | 49 | 42 | 39 | 46 | 41 | 27 | | | | |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 21 | 33 | | 14 | 33 | 33 | | | | | |
| BLK | 37 | 44 | 55 | 40 | 35 | 26 | 35 | | | | |
| WHT | 81 | | | 62 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 36 | 42 | 52 | 36 | 35 | 30 | 29 | | | | |

| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SWD | | 18 | | 10 | 17 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 50 | 51 | 40 | 50 | 35 | 27 | 32 | | | | |
| WHT | 79 | 75 | | 57 | 50 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 45 | 51 | 39 | 45 | 39 | 37 | 45 | | | | |

## ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 45 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 315 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 34 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| **English Language Learners** | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |
| **Native American Students** | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| **Asian Students** | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |

| Asian Students | |
|---|---|
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Black/African American Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 41 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Hispanic Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Multiracial Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Pacific Islander Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| White Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - White Students | 74 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 40 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

## Analysis

### Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

The lowest performance was in our science proficiency on the 5th grade NGSSS Statewide Assessment. The factors that contributed to the decrease from 40% in 2018 to 33% in 2019 were the rotation schedule not allowing enough time to properly teach the science standards, a first year science teacher who struggled with the content, and a lack of consistent hands-on experiments/labs.

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.**

The greatest decline from the prior year was our ELA lowest 25th percentile which declined from 52% in 2018 to 42% in 2019, a 10 percentage point decrease. The factors that contributed to this decline were teachers not providing appropriate Tier 2 or Tier 3 support to the BQ, limited center rotations for differentiation, mostly whole group instruction taking place, teachers struggled to interpret data and make decisions about next steps, and classroom management issues.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

The greatest gap between school performance and state performance in 2019 was in science proficiency which had a 20% difference. The factors that contributed to this gap were the rotation schedule not allowing enough time to properly teach the science standards, a first year science teacher who struggled with the content, and a lack of consistent hands-on experiments/labs.

**Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

The most improvement in 2019 was in math learning gains which moved from 39% in 2018 to 49% in 2019, a 10 percentage point increase. The actions we took in this area included a math coach who was very experienced and pulled students frequently to provide the Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions needed to show student gains. The coach also built very strong relationships with her group of students further promoting an excitement for learning.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

1. Attendance below 90%
2. Level 1 on Statewide Assessments

**Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.**

1. Increase ELA L25% gains by 18 points to 60%
2. Increase Math L25% gains by 18 points to 60%
3. Increase Science achievement by 17 points to 50%
4. Increase Math and ELA proficiency levels for SWD from 23% and 22% respectively, to 40%
5. Increase Math and ELA proficiency levels for BLK students from 44% and 41% respectively, to 55%

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| #1 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | To increase the academic gains of our bottom quartile (BQ) in Reading to 60% and Math to 60%. |
| **Rationale** | Our 2018-19 data reflects that only 42% of our BQ students showed gains in Reading (a drop from 52% last school year) and only 42% in Math (an increase of 9% from last school year). |

| | |
|---|---|
| **State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve** | If assigned learning tasks/activities are appropriately structured to meet the individual needs of students and are fully aligned with grade level expectations/standards, then overall and BQ learning gains for all core subject areas will improve. Our goal is for 60% of our reading BQ students and 60% of our math BQ students to achieve gains in 2019-20. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Kristi Kincaid (ephriamk@duvalschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | 1. Provide time for instructional personnel to engage in focused professional development opportunities involving analysis of student achievement data and identification of correlated learning activities.<br>2. Purchase research-based curriculum for Tier 2 instruction such as Acaletics for Math<br>3. Enhance hands-on science application experiences connected to standards. Utilize Acaletics science curriculum for 5th grade.<br>4. Utilize a reading and math interventionist.<br>5. Increase the use of i-ready instruction in reading and math for tiered 2 support |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | 1. Most of our teachers are new (0-3 years experience) and need ongoing professional development in the areas of best instructional practices, classroom management, data collection and analysis, small group instruction, differentiation and standards driven instructional tasks. Throughout the school year, teachers will be given the opportunity to participate in professional development at the school level during collaborative planning and early release day activities, as well as district level professional development recommended by Administration and offered through the Unified Talent portal.<br>2. To provide teachers with proven, research-based curriculum materials to help close the learning gap of our BQ students.<br>3. Our reading and math interventionists will be leveraged to support our BQ students with Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction, as well as provide tiered support for our teachers as required. |

| Action Step | |
|---|---|
| **Description** | 1.<br>a. Instructional personnel will be given time during Early Release professional development sessions (preferably once per quarter) to collaborate with peers in disaggregating formative assessment data, identifying intervention resources/programs, and developing activities to remediate students' instructional areas of weakness and enrich students' s instructional strengths.<br>b. Instructional personnel will participate in common planning sessions with administration and coaches to review data from recent class/district assessments and utilize data tracking methods to identify learning gain and develop an action plan for students.<br>c. Instructional personnel will work together during common planning to discuss teacher/ student data chat forms with the purpose of conducting conferences with students to measure progress toward annual learning targets.<br>d. Administrations and coaches will identify model classrooms for differentiated, data-based |

core and/or center learning activities and allow time for teachers to observe best practices of peers with targeted pre- and post- briefings.
e. Administration will create a classroom daily schedule that adheres to the instructional framework and includes time for teachers to meet in differentiated small groups.
2.
a. Purchase Acaletics (for math intervention) and Reading Mastery (for reading intervention).
b. Provide opportunities for teachers to receive district-level professional development with the

implementation of both curriculums.
c. Progress monitor the implementation and fidelity of both curriculums.
3.
a. Hire a reading and math interventionist with suitable qualifications.
b. Clarify expectations, review student data, and develop a schedule for intervention.
c. Progress monitor the implementation and fidelity of instruction by both interventionists on a weekly basis.

**Person Responsible**  Kristi Kincaid (ephriamk@duvalschools.org)

| #2 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Continue to implement a positive behavior support system school-wide to lower our number of referrals by 50% to 124 and increase our restorative justice incidents from 16 to 32. |
| **Rationale** | Based on our 2018-19 school-wide discipline data, one of our primary goals is to focus on building a stronger PBIS system to support our students' social and emotional growth that will, in turn, promote increased engagement in learning and higher academic gains. |

| **State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve** | Our goal is for office managed discipline referrals to decrease by 50% to 124 total referrals (248 total in 18-19), our restorative justice (RJ) practices to increase by 100% to 32 (16 total in 18-19), and our out of school suspensions (OSS) to decrease by 50% to 8 (17 total in 18-19). |
|---|---|
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Kristi Kincaid (ephriamk@duvalschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | Provide on-going training and progress monitoring for all school personnel to implement a school-wide PBIS system and behavioral curriculum to define rules, expectations, and procedures for all students. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | There is inconsistent implementation of rituals/routines, behavioral curriculum and positive behavior support systems that will help to establish a student-centered culture for academic, social and emotional growth. |

| Action Step | |
|---|---|
| **Description** | 1. Administrators and PBIS Members will model and monitor school-wide expectations for all school personnel, parents and students implementing rituals and routines, positive behavior plans, and positive behavior curriculum in the classroom and common areas.<br>2. Teachers/staff will receive ongoing feedback from weekly walk-throughs focusing on behavioral expectations, student engagement and the classroom learning environment to celebrate successes and support areas of need.<br>3. Continually monitor school-wide discipline data to problem-solve areas of concern.<br>4. Provide ongoing learning opportunities to remind students of school and classroom expectations.<br>5. Teachers will implement classroom morning meetings from the Sanford Harmony curriculum.<br>6. Ongoing tiered support for students in small group and individually by providing opportunities for mentoring/tutoring with the Kindness Queen and Big Brothers/Sisters weekly |
| **Person Responsible** | Kristi Kincaid (ephriamk@duvalschools.org) |

## Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).**

1. Schoolwide safety-a schoolwide safety plan will be created and implemented for the 2019-20 school year which will include safety folders for every classroom, detailed safety procedures and code red

instructions, faculty and staff trainings/progress monitoring throughout the school year and monthly fire and code red drills to better prepare faculty and students in the event of a real emergency.

## Part IV: Title I Requirements

**Additional Title I Requirements**
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.**

We take input from our stakeholders on activities they recommend and incorporate them into our planning. Student data is reviewed to assist families to find the areas of weakness to support their child and create workshops to strengthen the school and parent relationship. Our workshops cover math, reading, science, and positive behavior.

**PFEP Link**
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

**Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.**

Our full-time School Counselor pushes into classrooms K-5 to present guidance lessons focused on character development. He is also available to counsel individual students upon referral and student/ parent request.

**Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.**

RL Brown will offer current 5th grade students and their families an event designed by Admin and our school Counselor to help with the transition to Middle School. Parent's will be able to inquire about steps needed to transition to middle school. School choice deadlines, etc. will be shared and explored to prepare for upcoming promotions to 6th grade. This will ensure a smooth academic transition from elementary to middle school.

**Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.**

Leadership meetings are held weekly which include Admin, two school Interventionists, and the School Counselor. Topics discussed include curriculum effectiveness, classroom and individual student data, blended learning platforms, curriculum and district assessments, Florida standard alignment, etc. This information is disseminated to teachers through weekly walk-through's and collaborative planning sessions.
Collaborative planning is conducted at least once per week. Attendees vary week to week but will include Admin, Interventionists and/or grade-level teachers. Topics discussed include student data, assessments, classroom management strategies, schedules, curriculum, resources, standards, etc.

**Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.**

In January 2020, our School Counselor will conduct classroom lessons for K-5 in career exploration and in February 2020, we will host a career fair with representatives from various career clusters for K-5 as well. Based on future funding, we are planning to provide college tours for students in grades 3-5 and college week in October.